

**The Building Code Standards Committee
will meet on November 4, 2010, at
One Capitol Hill, Conference Room A
Providence, Rhode Island**

648th	Meeting	1:00 p.m.	November
4, 2010			

1. Call to order

2. Public Hearing

3. Appeal

4. Approval of Minutes of last meeting

5. Correspondence

6. Committee Reports

7. Legislation

8. Old Business

9. New Business

10. Announcements

**647th
2010**

Meeting

1:00 p.m.

October 14,

1. Chairman Durand called the meeting of the Building Code Standards Committee called to order at 1:08 p.m.

2. Public Hearing: None at this time

3. Appeals: 10-09 Electric Boat Corporation

Requesting a variance to expand a new and existing non-residential building to have a floor elevation below the required design flood elevation. Appeal Passed

4. A motion was made to pass the minutes from the October 14, 2010 meeting by Mr. Newbrook and seconded by Mr. Palmisciano. Motion passed unanimously.

5 CORRESPONDENCE: This past May or June the Board had voted to remove some certifications of Building Officials that did not have enough certified credits. Karen has written a letter requesting to come before the Board to partition the approval to be reinstated. Karen Pare' has been a Certified Building Official for the past twenty (20) years and have been a participating member of the Building Association. I have always taken above and beyond the required classes and have taken more credits that have been required.

According to the Cycle that is said that I had not completed Karen had fifty two (52) credits, the credit that is in question were under the electrical end of certification. Since then I have taken classes and also have taken classes on line with ICC. Karen stated that she was not aware of her certification was revoked till this past summer when she sent her dues in for the Rhode Island Building Officials Association and Dave Tacey stated he received a letter. Karen stated that the whole communication process with this is very confusing and was led to believe that she was all set and now I am being told that I am missing five (5) credits in electrical. If that is the case and I am missing the five (5) credits I am partitioning the Board today to please allow me to please make up the classes and get this certification reinstated. Questions were asked if a letter was sent out and it could not be confirmed if one was sent out due to it not being sent out certified. Mr. Leyden stated that the State Building Code Commissions office has learned its lesson and from this date forward all letters will be sent out certified.

A motion was made to allow one (1) year to complete the five (5) credits that are needed in electrical cycle and to be current in the 2012 code cycle. Motion was made by Mr. Balemian and seconded by Mr. Nash. Motion passed by majority.

6 COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Residential Sprinkler Sub-Committee – Has completed all work, two members were not able to attend today's meeting so it was decided that we would not take a vote of what our final recommendations would be until we were all in attendance. Our next meeting will be on November 1, 2010. We are hoping to have our decision brought to the Board soon.

7. LEGISLATION: None at this time

8 OLD BUSINESS: Discussion on CSST has been continuing and there are people here that would like to speak on this matter. Our sub-Committees (Electrical and Fuel Gas Sub-Committee) have met and have written a Blanket Variance to change the code. Today, there are a group of people that would like to hold off on the Blanket Variance to correct some of the language.

Peg representing Gas Tight Manufacturing had come before the Board in July/August time frame to request a code change after the new code implemented a ban on the sale of any CSST systems that would require bonding, per the installation instructions. We have been engaged in good faith negotiations with Mr. Fink over the last couple of months in we feel we are moving in a good direction we were under the impression that we were very close to a condition that would satisfy the Board and allow the companies to sell their products. Late in the day on Tuesday, it was learned that some

additional language had come into play that had not been part of our discussion. The Blanket Variance now addresses CSST Systems with a conductive jacket that does not require bonding. This language is significant to our client and would most appreciate to have the opportunity to submit documentation and be heard on this particular issue. Unfortunately due to the timing of this and the travel by our client (have one client here today who flew in on the red eye from California) we have not been able to get together to address these issues to be prepared today. Today we are asking the Board to please continue that matter and allow the company Gas Tight and Ward an opportunity to be fully heard on the matter after some discussion.

Would like to have Jim Fink explain to the Board what has been going so it does not seem like we have rushed this. I want it clarified that discussions have been going on for two (2) months.

Mr. Fink confirms that discussions have been on going for two (2) months. As a matter in good faith we have been reviewing the language of the Blanket Variance with them. Discussion originally initially surrounded the length of the bonding jumper that we required, inspections and permitting and I feel that we have reached a mutual resolution on all items. In our draft Blanket Variance language we also have statement in regards listing requirements on new CSST.

This meaning the CSST does not require bonding. I believe that this is the subject specifically where the objections now lies from the parties before us today.

Mr. Mark Torban spoke on behalf of being the founder and principle of Cutting Edge Solutions and currently Director of Code and Standards for Omega Flex of Middletown Connecticut. I have done a lot of research in this area. I have also participated in the process of trying to rectify some of the language in the code. In principle to Omega Flex, they have no problem with language as currently proposed. Omega Flex makes one product that will comply with the conductive jacket requirement. For sake of discussion I do have some issues. Mr. Torban would like to make some recommendations to improve the current language, regarding the length of the bonding jumper. I find this to be overly restrictive and possibly un-enforceable. Principle, compared to the previous code proposal or language this allows all CSST products whether it be “yellow jacket or black jacket tubing” that is sold and installed here in the State of Rhode Island in accordance to the manufactures instructions. I do feel though that there is on typo in that when you refer to section 2411.1 and 310.0, 310.0 should be 310.1 which covers bonding requirements through the equipment grounding conductor. My major concern is with two sentences in the Blanket Variance “the bonding jumper would exceed 40’ in length. CSST shall be prohibited in cases where the required bonding jumper would exceed 40’ in length.” There is nothing to my knowledge in the National Electrical Code that stipulates or limits the length of grounding conductor, a bonding conductor jumper or even electro conductor. There is nothing for a specified limitations in the Electrical Code. Additionally,

the effectiveness of these jumpers whether it be for grounding electrode or bonding is not just the function of the language, it is the function the particular choice whether it is single stranded or multi stranded, copper or aluminum and the size or wire gage. By restricting the length to forty feet does not really lend itself to the current practices as included in the National Electrical Code.

A motion was made that we continue this discussion for one month to give Gas Tight more time to research our language by Mr. Brown and seconded by Mr. Palmisciano. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Turner had on other comment in regards to the path that we have traveled with this issue. Believe there was a time when manufacturer's instruction seemed to contradict Electrical Code.

9 NEW BUSINESS: Blanket Variances regarding Property Maintenance Code

This Blanket Variance would allow the Cities and Towns to use both the Department of Health and the Housing Resources Commission for comprehensive environmental lead inspection that will conform to the Department of Health regulations.

Motion was made to pass the Blanket Variance as written by Mr. Turner and seconded by Mr. Carlson. Majority passed.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS: None at this time

ADJOURN:

There being no further business to come before the Building Code Standards Committee, a motion was made to adjourn by Mr. Newbrook and seconded by Mr. Palmisciano. The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

John P. Leyden

Executive Secretary

BUILDING CODE BOARD OF APPEALS:

Members Present: D. Aschman, B. Balemian, B. Bernard, R. Brown, J. Carlson, J. Fink, W. Howe, W. Nash, D. Newbrook, M. Newman, J. Pagliaro, D. Palmisciano, G. Preiss, R. Stillings, S. Turner

Staff Members Present: T. Coffey, J. Leyden and J. Enos,

Members Absent: T. Chabot, R.Collins, B. Davey, R. DeBlois, P. DePace, A. Durand, D. Gagnon,

Staff Members Absent:

The next meeting of the Building Code Standards Committee will be held on Thursday, November 4, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. at One Capitol Hill, Conference Room A.